



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,925	07/31/2003	Yariv Aridor	ROC920020171US1	9659
30206	7590	01/10/2008		
IBM CORPORATION ROCHESTER IP LAW DEPT. 917 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER RUTTEN, JAMES D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2192	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/631,925		ARIDOR ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	John J. Romano		2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John J. Romano. (3) _____

(2) Scott A. Stinebruner, Reg. No. 38,323. (4) _____

Date of Interview: October 18th, 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Bartz and Thomas.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ERIC B. KISS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed patentability of amended claims over Bartz and Thomas (see attached interview agenda). In particular, Applicant's representative explained that the modified version and standard code base are developed by different entities and that the modified version adapts original code base for use on a particular computer. The examiner agreed that claim language defining the second release of a standard code base released by a different entity, wherein the changes to the original modified code base are subsequently applied to generate a second modified release would overcome Bartz' disclosure of version management. The examiner noted that a subsequent search would be necessary in view of the claim language formally submitted; in particular to overcome delta versioning of two different versions released by two different entities; possibly api delta versioning or similar concept. Examiner will await Applicant's formal response and perform further search and/or consideration as necessary.

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

BRUCE TITTEL
DAVID S. STALLARD
J. ROBERT CHAMBERS
GREGORY J. LUNN
KURT L. GROSSMAN
GLENN H. HUKEN, JR.
THOMAS J. BURGER
GREGORY F. AIRENS
WAYNE L. JACOBS
KURT A. SUMME
KEVIN G. ROONEY
KEITH R. LAIPT
THEODORE R. RFMAKUS
THOMAS W. HUMPHREY
SCOTT A. STINEBRUNER
DAVID H. BRINKMAN
BEVERLY A. LYMAN, PH.D.
KRISTI L. DAVISON
KATHRYN E. SMITH
P. ANDREW BLATT, PH.D.
DAVID E. JEFFRIES
J. DWIGHT POFFENBERGER, JR.
WILLIAM R. ALLEN, PH.D.

OF COUNSEL
JOHN D. POFFENBERGER
DAVID J. JOSEPHIC
DONALD F. FREI
THOMAS W. FLYNN
BRADLEY D. BECK

2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-2917

TELEPHONE: 513-241-2324

FACSIMILE: 513-241-6234

WEBSITE: www.whepatent.com

PATENT, TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT
AND UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW
AND RELATED LITIGATION

EDMUND F. WOOD 1929-1968
TRUMAN A. HERRON 1935-1976
EDWARD H. EVANS 1930-1971

JOSEPH R. JORDAN
C. RICHARD EBY
JOHN PAUL DAVIS
DOUGLAS A. SCHOLER
BRETT A. SCHAIZ
DAVID W. DORTON
SAKAM OTTE GRABER
STEVEN W. BENINTENDI, PH.D.
RANDALL S. JACKSON, JR.
ADAM R. WEEKS
CHARLES R. FIGH, JR.
KEVIN E. KUCHIN
PATENT AGENTS
ANA C. JACQUEZ
MICHAEL H. SCHENKER

October 16, 2007

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

To: Examiner John Romano
Art Unit 2192
The United States Patent and Trademark
Office

From: Scott A. Stinebruner

Re: Application No. 10/631,925
Our File: IBM/234

Pages: 2 (including cover sheet)

Fax: 571-273-3872

Enclosures:

Fax Cover Sheet containing Certificate of
Facsimile Transmission (1 page)
Agenda and Proposed Amendments
(1 page)

MESSAGE/COMMENTS

Interview Agenda attached.

The information in this facsimile message is ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, WORK PRODUCT and/or CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom this message is addressed. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via mail. Thank you. If transmission is interrupted or of poor quality, please notify us immediately by calling (513) 241-2324 and ask for the sender's assistant. OUR FAX NUMBER IS (513) 241-6234.

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY 10/18/2007

Proposed Agenda

10/631,925

4:00pm, Thursday, October 18, 2007

Examiner John Romano - AU2192 (x3872)

§103 Rejections

Proposed Amendment:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for adapting a standard code base, the method comprising:

canonically parsing a modified version of a first release of a standard code base to generate a canonically-parsed representation of the modified version;

generating difference data representative of changes made to the first release of the standard code base using the canonically-parsed representation of the modified version; and

using the difference data in applying the changes made to the first release of the standard code base to a second release of the standard code base after the second release has been released, to generate a modified version of the second release of the standard code base.

Agenda:

Discuss patentability of amended claims over Bartz and Thomas